



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

M. Larivière practically acknowledges that this principle was what she seemed to detest in the French Revolution, for he remarks that she never drew any line of distinction between the Constituent and the Legislative Assembly or the Convention. Still he finds some contradiction in Catherine's conduct because she supported the champions of despotic authority for France, while at the same time she sought to destroy the strong monarchical government provided in Poland by the new constitution. This is a confusion of mind due to the similarity of words covering totally dissimilar processes. It is safe to say that the *émigrés* would never have subscribed to a constitution like that of Poland, neither would the Polish patriots have struggled for a monarchy after the ideals cherished at Coblentz.

In one instance Catherine showed herself astonishingly liberal even when the reactionary spirit had seemingly taken complete possession of her mind. This was the retention of La Harpe at court as the tutor of her grandsons, one of whom was to become the Emperor Alexander, although La Harpe did not hesitate to identify the cause of political and social Revolution with that of philosophy. M. Larivière might have added point to his description of this affair had he quoted the young Alexander's remark to Prince Adam Czartoryski about the French Revolution, instead of alluding only to the controversy in which Alexander argued against the principle of hereditary monarchies. Alexander said that "he had taken the strongest interest in the French Revolution, and that while condemning its terrible excesses, he wished the French Republic success and rejoiced at its establishment."¹

The later chapters of M. Larivière's book give much curious information about Catherine's opinions of men like Necker and Mirabeau, and her dealings with Sénac de Meilhan, who proposed to write a history of her reign. In the sections on Necker he carries minute scholarship to a profitless extent in writing six pages on what Catherine thought of Madame Necker, with the conclusion that she evidently regarded Madame Necker as a meritorious woman: "Tout, du moins, porte à le croire; car elle s'abstint de le dire." As an appendix to his work M. Larivière publishes the remarkable memoir of Catherine on the Revolution, written in 1792, which serves to confirm the conclusions he has reached. There are a few errors in the proof-reading of dates which will doubtless be corrected in a subsequent edition.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Napoleone: Una Pagina storico-psicologica del Genio. Per AUGUSTO TEBALDI, professore nella R. Università di Padova. (Padova: Angelo Draghi. 1895. Pp. iii, 168.)

WE have in this book a study of Napoleon from the point of view of a professor of mental diseases. His apology for offering a new contribution

¹ *Memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski*, edited by Adam Gielgud (London, 1888), I. iii.

to the literature of this subject is that his point of view and his line of inquiry are novel ones. Holding aloof from the expression of any judgment upon Napoleon as a captain, politician, or legislator, he proposes to himself the examination of the following thesis: "If the psychical manifestations of the individual are the resultant of the organic conditions of his being and of the environment in which his activities unfold themselves, many facts of the mind and heart of Napoleon find their explanation in his organism." The novelty of his effort consists not in his undertaking to make a psychological study of his subject, not in the examination of physical qualities and predispositions, but in his relegation of the historical element so far to the rear. This last he makes use of only in so far as it helps to throw light upon Napoleon's physical and psychical states at various stages of his career. This complete abdication, however, of the office of critic leads to results which can fairly be called partial. Such must be the case when one has to do with a many-sided individual. One noteworthy mistake of this kind is the author's apparently serious treatment of Napoleon's threat to resign his command in 1796 on the alleged ground of ill-health. Another is the emphasis put upon his gradual physical breakdown and the consequent loss of mental strength, to account for his final overthrow. However great the difference between the Bonaparte of 1796 and the Napoleon of 1815, — and perhaps the difference was not so great as has often been supposed, — the difference between his opponents of 1796 and those of 1815 was infinitely greater. The Napoleon of 1815 was sufficiently like the Bonaparte of 1796 to have won his Italian campaigns over again against such leaders as he then faced. Twenty years had wrought greater changes in the conditions, institutions, and peoples of Europe than in Napoleon.

Professor Tebaldi, however, does not pretend to give a complete psycho-physical formula to explain the puzzle of the Corsican's career, but to have made clear some facts with reference to his physical constitution which contribute not a little to an understanding of his psychical manifestations. The method of treatment is that of the physician's diagnosis, and naturally, therefore, the author begins with the family history, more particularly with the weaknesses of body and the qualities of mind and character of his subject's parents. From that he passes to a minute examination of the subject himself, the measurements of his body and the characteristics of his physique. The acute nervous sensibility which manifested itself in numberless ways is particularly remarked. It is the source of his great powers; his energy, his command of himself, his faculty of suppressing every impression or idea except those which at any moment are in the field of consciousness, the extraordinarily rapid working of his mind, his marvellous impressional receptivity. On the other hand, this nervous sensibility was a contributing cause of constantly increasing potency in the aggravation of his organic disorders, of the attacks of dizziness and faintness which some have called epilepsy. The author marshals the conflicting testimonies upon this point. In the end he reaches

no positive conclusion with regard to it, but contents himself by saying that if Napoleon was not an epileptic in the ordinary sense of that word, he certainly belonged to a family of "neuropathetics."

Closely allied with this nervous sensibility and this epileptic temperament, and largely accounted for by them, was the weak moral sense. Napoleon's psychical nature was so absorbed, so dominated by his intelligence, that little room was left for anything else. The author quotes with approval Lombroso's comparison of Napoleon with Cæsar, Mohammed, and other conquerors, as epileptic geniuses. When the epileptic tendency displays itself in the psychical field mental exuberances are more than likely to appear. "With a constitution of that kind not a few men of talent represent the unbalanced, the abnormal, the delinquent among geniuses."

JOHN H. CONEY.

Lord John Russell. By STUART J. REID. [The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1895. Pp. xvi, 381.)

SEVERAL years ago Spencer Walpole published a two-volume octavo biography of Earl Russell, or Lord John Russell, as he is known to history by his own preference. It received much praise and has since been regarded as the authority. Mr. Reid had no desire to supersede this with his monograph; evidently his aim was to reduce to the form of a brief and popular narrative the most accessible material and some important recollections respecting Russell. Lord John's political career does not readily lend itself to short and picturesque biography. Sydney Smith might well have said of his friend "Lord John Reformer," as he did of Melbourne, "I accuse our Minister of honesty and diligence." Russell also fulfilled Goethe's condition of greatness: he was devoted to one idea. But this was not all; with almost equal honesty and diligence he was also devoted to many other ideas, throughout a period of over half a century. When we thought of his part in the long contest over the change from rotten boroughs to a rational system of parliamentary representation, in the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, in bringing about Catholic Emancipation, in repealing the miserable Corn Laws and introducing the grand policy of Free Trade, in helping Ireland to more freedom and keeping her from starvation, in guiding the foreign policy during the war in the Crimea, in helping Italy to become a nation, and in trying to hold England to a just course of neutrality during our own Civil War, — when we thought of merely these questions, we did not expect to find that Mr. Reid had given more than a synopsis of historical events and biographical incidents. Instead of doing only this, he has written a vivacious and charming biography which assigns Lord John his proper place in history. The success is extraordinary. It is not often that small biographies of great statesmen add much to the knowledge of the reader or to the reputation of the hero. Mr. Reid has furnished an exception.

Russell wrote of himself shortly before his death: "I have committed